

REMARKS

In the prior Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 70 and 71 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The Examiner also responded in the prior Office Action as follows: rejected claims 24-29, 32-33, 53, 55-59, and 72-75 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Theimer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,493,692); rejected claims 50-52 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Herz (U.S. Patent No. 6,460,036); rejected claims 1-5, 7-22, 30-31, 34-39, 41-46, 48-49, and 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theimer in view of Paul (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,932); rejected claims 60-69 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theimer in view of Goldberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,264,560); and rejected claims 6, 23, 40, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theimer in view of Paul and Lang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,799).

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in the pending claims. While Applicants disagree that the prior art renders obvious any of the previously pending claims, Applicants have amended the claims in order to expedite prosecution so that all of the pending claims are in a form indicated by the Examiner to be allowable, as discussed in greater below. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to timely indicate allowance of all pending claims.

In particular, independent method claim has been amended to recite the claim elements of allowable dependent claim 70, claim 70 has been canceled, and claim 71 has been amended to correct its dependency. Thus, claim 60 is now in allowable form for at least the same reasons as was dependent claim 70. In addition, the claims that depend from independent claim 60 are each similarly allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 60 – those dependent claims include previously pending claims 61-69 and 71, and new claims 76-84.

Since new independent computer-readable medium claim 85 and new independent computing system claim 110 each contain language similar to that of claim 60 as amended, they are each allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 60, as are claims 86-109 and 111-131 that depend from claims 85 and 110, respectively.

In addition, claims 1-59 and 72-75 have been canceled.

Thus, claims 60-69, 71 and 76-131 are pending and are believed to be in allowable form. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 694-4815.

Respectfully submitted,

SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC



James A. D. White
Registration No. 43,985

JDW:asl

Enclosure:
Postcard

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6300
Seattle, Washington 98104-7092
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031